

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/851,867	•	05/09/2001	Hikmet Senay	72167.000572	4958	
21967	7590	04/19/2006		EXAMINER		
HUNTON	& WILL	IAMS LLP	PITARO, RYAN F			
		OPERTY DEPART	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
1900 K STREET, N.W.					TALERIONBER	
SUITE 1200		20006 1100	2174			
WASHING	ION, DC	20006-1109		DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			olication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			/851,867	SENAY, HIKMET				
			miner	Art Unit .				
		Rya	n F. Pitaro	2174				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appears	on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MODER IS LONGER, FROM THE MODER IS IN 18 OF THE MODERN IS	MAILING DATE s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). munication. latutory period will app y will, by statute, cause	OF THIS COMMUNICATION IN NO event, however, may a reply be by and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 🗆	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <i>08 Februa</i>	ary 2006.					
2a)□	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action	on is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
·	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims			•				
4)🛛	Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the	application.		•				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) 🗌	Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or ele	ction requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	: a) accepted	d or b) 🗌 objected to by th	e Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any obje	ection to the draw	ng(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	g the correction is	required if the drawing(s) is	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected t	o by the Examir	ner. Note the attached Offi	ce Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<i>'</i> —	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of:			(a)-(d) or (f).				
	 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
	3. Copies of the certified copies							
	application from the Internation	•		·				
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action	,	* **	ved.				
			·					
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	•	4) Interview Summa					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o		Paper No(s)/Mail	Date I Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	r No(s)/Mail Date	1 10/00/00)	6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

- 2. This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 3/3/2006.
- 3. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1,5,9,13,16 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eick et al ("Eick", US 5,835,085) in view of Jordan et al ("Jordan", US 5,745,113).

As per claim 1, Eick discloses a method for graphically representing interactions between units within an organization, which comprises: determining a connectivity measure for each unit (Column 4 lines 7-48); determining a diversity measure for each unit (Column 4 lines 7-48) providing a graphical object corresponding to each unit (Column 4 lines 29-36); positioning said graphical objects to correspond to the relative positions of the units within the organizational hierarchy (Column 4 lines 37-48); varying graphical properties of said graphical objects to correspond to the connectivity measure

and the diversity measure (Column 4 lines 29-36); and displaying on a display screen said graphical objects and interactions between the units represented by said graphical objects (Column 4 lines 7-48). Eick teaches each unit being a phone number which implies persons, however fails to distinctly point out the units of an organization being individual persons. However, Jordan teaches an organizational hierarchy made of individual persons (Column 1 lines 13-21). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Eick with the current teaching of Jordan. Motivation to do so would have been to help designers to find patterns in relationships and work practices.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Eick-Jordan teaches a method wherein said graphical properties of said graphical objects varied includes color of said graphical object according to the diversity measure (Eick, Column 4 lines 29-36).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Eick-Jordan teaches a method wherein said graphical properties of said graphical objects varied includes size of said graphical objects according to the connectivity measure (Eick, Column 4 lines 29-36).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Eick-Jordan teaches a method which further comprises providing for user selection of a portion of said display screen such that only those graphical objects within said user selected portion of said display screen are displayed (Eick, Figure 3).

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 5,8,13,16 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 6, 14,17 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 7,11,15 are similar in scope to that of claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 9, Eick-Jordan teaches a method for graphically representing interactions between an individual person and other persons with an organization (Jordan, Column 1 lines 13-21), which comprises: providing graphical objects corresponding to the interacting individual persons (Eick, Column 4 lines 29-36); varying graphical properties of said graphical objects to correspond to connectivity and the diversity measure (Eick, Column 4 lines 29-36); displaying on a display screen said graphical objects (Eick, Figure 3); and displaying on said display screen direct interactions between the individual persons (Eick, Figure 3) and indirect interactions between the individual persons to a preselected depth level (Eick, Column 4 lines 7-48, Figure 3).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 9, Eick-Jordan disclose a method

wherein said pre-selected depth level may be user selected (Eick, Column 4 lines 29-

64).

Claims 18-21 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 2, and are therefore

Page 5

rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-

4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through

Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro Art Unit 2174 Patent Examiner

RFP

Bustine Vincaid SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Page 6